

THE
AMERICAN CRISIS;

OR,

THE TRUE ISSUE,

SLAVERY OR LIBERTY?

BRITISH
COLLEGE
LIBRARY

REV. WILLIAM PATTON, D.D.,

NEW YORK, U.S.

LONDON:

SAMPSON LOW, SON, & CO., 47, LUDGATE HILL.

1861.

Carnegie Corp. Ed
Briggs
100

These pages are sent forth with the hope that they may help the reader in forming his opinion of the origin and probable result of the present war in America, as well as its bearings upon the great question of Slavery.

LONDON, July, 1861.

They appeared originally in the columns
of the "Daily News".
No

307518

THE AMERICAN CRISIS.

THE UNITED STATES ONE NATION.

PREVIOUSLY to the war of the Revolution, each of the American colonies was an independent sovereignty, so far as the other colonies were concerned, but each owing allegiance to the British crown.

During the war of Independence, they were united under "articles of confederation," agreed to in Congress, November 15th, 1777, and ratified by eight States, but not fully ratified by all until 1781. This confederation consisted of thirteen articles, the preamble of which is as follows:—"Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union between the States of New Hampshire, Massachusetts-Bay, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia." The second article reads,—“Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right, which is not by this confederation expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled.” The third article reads,—“The said States hereby severally enter into a firm league of friendship with each other, for their common defence, the security of their liberties, and their mutual and general welfare, binding themselves to assist each other, &c.”

This league or compact continued in operation during the war, and for some years thereafter. It will be noticed that it was a confederation of the States in their organic and separate sovereignties. This is fully recognised in all the articles, so that to a considerable extent the general Government then acted through the State organizations.

But the most serious difficulties were experienced in the working of this compact. They were felt whilst the external pressure of the war was upon them, but still more severely when peace was restored. These difficulties were the subject of discussion in the legislatures of the separate States, and of the correspondence of the eminent statesmen of that day. They all freely admitted

“the deplorable condition of the finances, the utter incompetency of the Congress of the Confederation to raise a revenue, support public credit, regulate trade or commerce, or to provide for the wants and safety of the country”—these and other evils, acknowledged to be inevitable under the articles of confederation, demanded a radical change, and likewise the adoption of some other form of government, by which the confusion and impotency inevitable to a league or compact between independent States might be avoided. So universal were the complaints, and so unanimous was this conviction, that delegates were appointed from the States, who met in convention at Philadelphia, on May 14th, 1787; and on September 17th of the same year they agreed upon the draft of the Constitution, which they transmitted to the Congress of the United States then in session, accompanied by a letter signed by George Washington, the President of the Convention. In this letter I call attention to the following:—“In all our deliberations on this subject, we kept steadily in view that which appears to us the greatest interest of every true American—the consolidation of our Union, in which is involved our prosperity, felicity, safety, perhaps our national existence.”

On the 28th of September of the same year the Congress, by a unanimous resolution, directed that this Constitution be “submitted to a convention of delegates chosen in each State by the people thereof.” The people of each State elected their delegates; the Constitution was submitted to and carefully scrutinised by the respective conventions thus appointed, and ratified by the convention of each State separately. Just at this point it is important to notice the preamble to this Constitution. It reads, “We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.” The object was not to form a confederacy of States—that they had already tried, and found it wanting; that they desired to get rid of—their object was “to form a more perfect Union,” and to secure the very things in which the confederation had failed,—viz., “to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty for themselves and their posterity.” Therefore, in order to secure all these, which the confederation of States could not secure to us, “we, the people of the United States, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.” Thus the people of the States, by adopting,

in their separate conventions, this Constitution, merged their separate sovereignties into one nation, all being integral parts of that nation. They knew perfectly what they were doing when they declared, in the sixth article of the Constitution, "That this Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." The people of the United States is the only party by whom this instrument is executed. It is not the people and the States, but the people alone; the people as the elemental source of power, rising above all existing sovereignties, and ordaining a Constitution for the nation. This Constitution provides, Article IV., that new States may be admitted and form integral parts of the nation. Thus, twenty-one have been added, and the nation, called the United States, has increased from about three to thirty millions of population, all governed by the same Constitution and general laws, all recognising the same flag, and all entitled to vote for the officers named in the Constitution.

Now, it will be remembered that the letter of the convention which drafted this Constitution, and which, with the Constitution, was submitted to the conventions of the respective States, expressly declares that the object steadily kept in view was "the consolidation of our Union, in which is involved our prosperity, felicity, safety, perhaps our national existence."

What was meant by "the consolidation of our Union" will appear more perfectly by an examination of the various provisions of the Constitution. The delegates of the conventions knew perfectly before giving their assent what powers the Constitution claimed for the general national Government, and what were allowed to the States in their local organizations. By this Constitution, Article I., all the fundamental rights of nationality or independent sovereignties are denied to the separate States. They cannot have fortifications within their borders unless they are owned and built and manned by the general Government, the land in every case being conveyed to the United States by a regular title-deed. They cannot have fleets or armies; they cannot coin money or establish a currency; they cannot send ambassadors to foreign countries or make treaties; they cannot declare or make war, not even repel invasion except when necessity will not allow time for national action; they cannot contract alliances, annex, purchase, or acquire any territory beyond their original bounda-

ries ; they cannot establish a postal arrangement or levy any customs duties on exports or imports. All these are expressly forbidden to the separate States, and are vested in the general Government. Thus, by their own act, the people of the once sovereign States abandoned the old articles of confederation, and merged their separate independency into one nation under a Constitution ; consequently the national Government acts not, as under the old confederacy, through State organizations, but directly upon the citizens of the States themselves, in all the departments of its government.

On the other hand, the powers left to the separate States were simply the regulation of their own internal and local affairs, including the making of State laws, the altering of State Constitutions, and the doing of all that is necessary for the maintenance of civil society within their own boundaries. No law in any State is of binding force if declared by the proper United States court contrary to the Constitution of the United States. So also it is required that "the senators, and representatives, and all the members of the several State legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States, and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution."—ART. VI.

Every new State must declare its approval of the Constitution of the United States, and its desire to be admitted to constitute a part of this one nation, and an affirmative vote of both Houses of Congress is necessary thus to incorporate them as integral parts of the nation. Each new State must submit its constitution to the inspection and approval of Congress, and if anything therein is found conflicting with the Constitution of the United States, it is remanded for alteration. Up to the present time, all these powers of the general Government have been most fully recognised, and by none more practically and frequently than by the States now claiming the right to secede. When the titles to Indian lands within their bounds were to be extinguished, they called on the United States to do it. When troublesome Indian tribes were to be conquered and removed, they depended upon the army and the treasury of the United States to do it. When new territories were to be purchased or conquered, out of which new Slave States were to be formed, they called upon the army and the treasury of the United States to do it. When war was to be carried on, as that of 1812 against England, and that of 1845 against Mexico, both wars for Southern interests, and against which the North protested, they used the army, the navy, and the treasury of the United States to do it.

This statement of facts will show that it is a misnomer to call

the States of the Union "independent States," or "separate and distinct republics," or "confederated republics." The thirty-four States are not a confederacy of independent sovereignties, and the Constitution is not an agreement or compact made between thirty-four partners. The United States is the union of all the people in one nation, each State with its population being an integral part of the whole. So that South Carolina, Virginia, and Georgia are as really integral parts of the nation called the United States, as Ireland, Scotland, and Wales are integral parts of the nation called Great Britain.

So the framers of the Constitution understood it ; so the people of the original thirteen States understood it ; so the people of the twenty-one new States, on being admitted to the Union, understood it. All believed in the statement of the eloquent Patrick Henry, himself a Virginian, "That this is a consolidated Government is demonstrably clear. The language is, 'we, the people,' instead of 'we, the States.' It must be one great consolidated national Government of the people of all the States." So, then, when the confederacy of the thirteen States was abandoned, and the people, "in order to form a more perfect union, ordained and established" the Constitution, which was adopted by the people of the several States acting, through their chosen delegates, in conventions, all independent sovereignties or confederacy of States ceased, and the people in all the States constituted one nation, known as the United States, and governed by one Constitution, which was proclaimed and accepted as the supreme law of the land.

WASHINGTON AND THE CONSTITUTION.

Among the most remarkable of great men, endowed with peculiar gifts, stands General George Washington. He possessed those powers of mind and heart which eminently fitted him for a counsellor, and, indeed, gave him almost authoritative control over deliberative assemblies. It was in this capacity that he did most excellent service in that memorable convention of delegates which met at Philadelphia, 14th May, 1787. He appeared in that body of patriotic men as the delegate from Virginia, was elected the President, and presided over all its deliberations. The difficulty of administering an efficient Government, under the then-existing articles of confederation, had become more and more obvious. Those articles, adopted in 1781, fully recognised the independent sovereignty of each State, and required the general Government to

act through them. This was the parent of innumerable evils, which so accumulated, that the wise and patriotic saw that some other form of Government must be adopted, or all that they held dear would be lost. They all admitted "the incompetency of the Congress of the Confederation to raise a revenue, to support the public credit, regulate trade or commerce, or to provide for the wants and safety of the country." It was the strong and universal conviction that the best interests of the country demanded a radical change, and the adoption of a new and more efficient form of Government. It was to accomplish this that the delegates assembled in convention at Philadelphia, 14th May, 1787. On the 17th of September of the same year, this convention adopted a draft of a Constitution which they presented to the "United States in Congress assembled," accompanied with a letter and two resolutions.

THE LETTER.

This was dated Philadelphia, September 17th, 1787, addressed to his Excellency the President of the Congress, and signed by George Washington, President of the Convention. There are three sentences in the letter which demand our particular notice. The *first* is, "The friends of our country have long seen and desired that the power of making war, peace, and treaties, that of levying money and regulating commerce, and the correspondent executive and judicial authorities, should be fully and effectually vested in the general Government of the Union; but the impropriety of delegating such extensive trust to one body of men is evident; hence results the necessity of a different organization." Different organization from what? The only organization they then had was that of the confederation of the thirteen independent sovereignties. The opinion of Washington, nay, of all the delegates, as expressed in this letter, was, that the powers above-named, and which were essential to an efficient Government, could not be *delegated* to one body of men, but must be *fully and effectually vested* in the general Government of the Union. "Hence results the necessity of a different organization." These powers, essential to nationality and to an efficient Government, cannot be *delegated* by the States to the Federal authority, but they must be "fully and effectually vested in the general Government." This was the great fundamental change, and it involved the surrender of all independent State sovereignties, and the full and effectual vesting in the general Government of the Union all the high prerogatives of sovereignty and nationality.

The *second* sentence thus declares the purpose of the convention: "In all our deliberations on this subject, we kept steadily in our

view that which appears to us the greatest interest of every true American—the consolidation of our Union, in which is involved our prosperity, felicity, safety, perhaps our national existence.”

Here it is to be noticed that the “CONSOLIDATION OF OUR UNION” was the one great aim of all the deliberations of the convention. But how consolidate our Union? The previous sentence we have quoted fully explains the *how*: it was by the surrender of State sovereignties, and the full and effectual vesting of all the powers essential to sovereignty and nationality in the general Government of the Union. The letter expresses the opinion that this change was essential in order to secure the prosperity, felicity, safety, and perhaps the very existence of the nation.

The *third* sentence shows how the necessity of the adoption of this new and radical change impressed the delegates, and led them to act in harmony. “This important consideration, seriously and deeply impressed on our minds, led each State in the convention to be less rigid on points of inferior magnitude than might have been otherwise expected; and thus the Constitution which we now present is the result of a spirit of amity, and of that mutual deference and concession which the peculiarity of our political situation rendered indispensable.” Such, then, are the opinions of Washington and the other delegates upon the radical change which the Constitution was designed to effect in the Government.

THE RESOLUTIONS.

There were only two, and the first was “Resolved, that the preceding Constitution be laid before the United States in Congress assembled, and that it is the opinion of this convention that it should afterwards be submitted to a convention of delegates, chosen in each State by the people thereof, under the recommendation of its legislature, for their assent and ratification, that each convention assenting to and ratifying the same should give notice thereof to the United States in Congress assembled.”

Three things here demand attention. The *first* is, that as the delegates were appointed by the State legislatures, it was only proper that the Constitution should go through them to the people of the States. Hence the language “under the recommendation of its legislature.” As the proposed change of Government demanded the surrender of independent State sovereignties and the vesting fully and effectually of sovereignty and nationality in the Government of the Union, each legislature would carefully scrutinise this Constitution, and only on the approval of it recommend the election of delegates by the people to assent to and ratify the same.

The legislature of each State did authorize the required convention to be chosen by the people, and by this act they did put their own seal of approbation upon it. The *second* thing is, that the delegates whose prerogative it was to adopt and ratify this Constitution were not, in any case, to be appointed by the legislature, but, in every State, by the people thereof. Thus all authority was taken from the legislature, and upon the delegates chosen by the people was the responsibility devolved of assenting to and of ratifying the Constitution. The *third* thing is, that the notice of assent and ratification of the conventions, thus chosen, was not to be given to the legislatures, but directly to "the United States in Congress assembled." This resolution plainly proves that the framers of the Constitution understood that under the new Constitution all State sovereignties should cease.

The *second* resolution provides, "That as soon as the conventions of nine States shall have ratified this Constitution, Congress was to fix a day on which electors should be appointed by the States, and also a day when these electors should assemble to elect a President; that the vote of these electors should be certified and signed, sealed, and directed, as the Constitution requires, to the Secretary of the United States in Congress assembled; that they should be opened in the presence of the senators and representatives, and the votes counted; and that then the Congress, together with the President, should, without delay, proceed to execute this Constitution." This resolution, in all its provisions, so far from recognising independent State sovereignties, it ignores them, it launches the ship of state, fully mans it, and starts it off on the great voyage by the direct agency of the people, and of the people alone. If just here we read over the Constitution as drafted by the convention and ratified by the people, we must be convinced that it is a Constitution of the people, of the whole people, for the government of themselves; that whilst it fully vests all sovereignty and nationality in the general Government,—giving to it "the power of making war, peace, and treaties,—of levying money and regulating commerce, and the correspondent executive and judicial authorities,"—it denies all these to the States individually or collectively, as States; thus settling the question in the opinion of Washington and his fellow-delegates, that under the Constitution there is no such thing as independent State sovereignties.

THE EXPERIENCE OF EIGHT YEARS.

In the farewell address of George Washington to the people of the United States on retiring from the office of President which he held for eight years, he has recorded some of the convictions of his

own mind as to the workings of this new Constitution which consolidated the Union. Of the necessity for such a Government, he thus testifies :—" To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a Government for the whole is indispensable. No alliance, however strict, between the parts, can be adequately substituted ; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all time, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a Constitution of Government better calculated than your former for an intimate Union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This Government, the offspring of your own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty." Here we have the deliberate judgment of this great and good man. He knew the terrible evils which grew out of the confederacy of independent States. He gave his ablest counsel in the framing of the new Constitution. He had for eight years personally and intimately watched, as the President of the Union, the workings of a consolidated Union under the Constitution ; and now, on retiring from public to private life, he tells the people what he thinks of the change from the confederation of independent States to the consolidation of our Union under the Constitution. He proceeds, " The basis of our political system is the right of the people to make and to alter their Constitutions of Government ; but the Constitution which at any time exists, till changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly binding upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish Government, presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established Government. All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations, under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberation and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive to this fundamental principle and of fatal tendency."

But still more definite and instructive are the following sentences :—" The unity of Government which constitutes you one people is also now dear to you. It is justly so ; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence—the support of your tranquillity at home, your peace abroad, of your safety, of your

property, of that very liberty which you so highly prize." This was the deliberate judgment of this great man after watching and administering the Constitution for eight years. "The unity of Government which constitutes you one people is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence—the support of your tranquillity at home, your peace abroad, of your safety, of your property, of that very liberty which you so highly prize." He not only thus expressed his own conviction of the inestimable importance of the "consolidation of the Union" to the best permanent interests of the people, even to the preservation of liberty itself, but he thus utters his deep-toned and emphatic warnings against the very first movement towards any infraction of this Union:—"But as it is easy to foresee that from different causes and from different quarters, much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth,—as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed;—it is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national Union, to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immoveable attachment to it, accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity—watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety—discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned—and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts."

No man can ponder these testimonies of Washington, and any longer doubt what were the opinions of this great man about the meaning of the Constitution, or about the prosperity and security which it had provided for the people, or that he regarded its perpetuity as the great blessing to be most sacredly guarded, or that he frowned indignantly upon the very slightest intimation of a disruption of the Union, or that he regarded it as the duty of the Government to put down any and every secession as treason and rebellion. His emphatic language is "that the Constitution which at any time exists, till changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all." This vote the seceders have not obtained; they have not in any way sought to obtain it; hence they must be branded with treason, and it is obligatory upon the Federal Government to bring their entire force to put down this rebellion, and to maintain the integrity of the Union.

WEBSTER AND THE CONSTITUTION.

We quote the following from the speech of the Hon. DANIEL WEBSTER in the Senate of the United States, January, 1833, in reply to the Resolutions offered by Mr. CALHOUN, of South Carolina, affirming the right of secession :—

And now, Sir, against all these theories and opinions, I maintain,—

1. That the Constitution of the United States is not a league, confederacy, or compact between the people of the several States in their sovereign capacities ; but a Government proper, founded on the adoption of the people, and creating direct relations between itself and individuals.

2. That no State authority has power to dissolve these relations ; that nothing can dissolve them but revolution ; and that, consequently, there can be no such thing as secession without revolution.

3. That there is a supreme law, consisting of the Constitution of the United States, and acts of Congress passed in pursuance of it, and treaties ; and that, in cases not capable of assuming the character of a suit in law or equity, Congress must judge of, and finally interpret, this supreme law so often as it has occasion to pass acts of legislation, and in cases capable of assuming, and actually assuming, the character of a suit, the Supreme Court of the United States is the final interpreter.

4. That an attempt by a State to abrogate, annul, or nullify an act of Congress, or to arrest its operation within her limits, on the ground that, in her opinion, such law is unconstitutional, is a direct usurpation on the just powers of the general Government, and on the equal rights of other States ; a plain violation of the Constitution, and a proceeding essentially revolutionary in its character and tendency.

Whether the Constitution be a compact between States in their sovereign capacities, is a question which must be mainly argued from what is contained in the instrument itself. We all agree that it is an instrument which has been in some way clothed with power. We all admit that it speaks with authority. The first question, then, is, What does it say of itself ? What does it purport to be ? Does it style itself a league, confederacy, or compact between sovereign States ? It is to be remembered, Sir, that the Constitution began to speak only after its adoption. Until it was ratified by nine States, it was but a proposal, the mere draught of an instrument. It was like a deed drawn, but not executed. The convention had framed it ; sent it to Congress, then sitting under the confederation ; Congress had transmitted it to the State legislatures ; and by these last it was laid before conventions of the people in the several States. All this while it was inoperative paper. It had received no stamp of authority, no sanction ; it spoke no language. But when ratified by the people in their respective conventions, then it had a voice, and spoke authentically. Every word in it had then received the sanction of the popular will, and was to be received as the expression of that will. What the Constitution says of itself, therefore, is as conclusive as what it says on any other point. Does it call itself a " compact ? " Certainly not. It uses the word *compact* but once, and that is when it declares that the States shall enter into no

compact. Does it call itself a "league," a "confederacy," a "subsisting treaty between the States?" Certainly not. There is not a particle of such language in all its pages. But it declares itself a *CONSTITUTION*. What is a *Constitution*? Certainly not a league, compact, or confederacy, but a *fundamental law*. The fundamental regulation which determines the manner in which the public authority is to be executed is what forms the *Constitution* of a State. Those primary rules which concern the body itself, and the very being of the political society, the form of government, and the manner in which power is to be exercised,—all, in a word, which form together the *Constitution of a State*,—these are the fundamental laws. This, Sir, is the language of the public writers. But do we need to be informed, in this country, what a *Constitution* is? Is it not an idea perfectly familiar, definite, and well settled? We are at no loss to understand what is meant by the *Constitution* of one of the States; and the *Constitution* of the United States speaks of itself as being an instrument of the same nature. It says, this *Constitution* shall be the law of the land, anything in any State *Constitution* to the contrary notwithstanding. And it speaks of itself, too, in plain contradistinction from a confederation; for it says that all debts contracted and all engagements entered into by the United States shall be as valid under this *Constitution* as under the *confederation*. It does not say, as valid under this *compact*, or this *league*, or this *confederation*, as under the former confederation, but as valid under this *Constitution*.

This, then, Sir, is declared to be a *Constitution*. A *Constitution* is the fundamental law of the State; and this is expressly declared to be the supreme law. It is as if the people had said, "We prescribe this fundamental law," or "this supreme law," for they do say that they establish this *Constitution*, and that it shall be the supreme law. They say that they *ordain and establish* it. Now, Sir, what is the common application of these words? We do not speak of *ordaining* leagues and compacts. If this was intended to be a compact or league, and the States to be parties to it, why was it not so said? Why is there found no one expression in the whole instrument indicating such an intent? The old confederation was expressly called a *league*; and into this league it was declared that the States, as States, severally entered. Why was not similar language used in the *Constitution*, if a similar intention had existed? Why was it not said, "the States enter into this new league," "the States form this new confederation," or "the States agree to this new compact?" Or why was it not said, in the language of the gentleman's resolution, that the people of the several States acceded to this compact in their sovereign capacities? What reason is there for supposing that the framers of the *Constitution* rejected expressions appropriate to their own meaning, and adopted others wholly at war with that meaning?

Again, Sir, the *Constitution* speaks of that political system which is established as "the Government of the United States." Is it not doing strange violence to language to call a league or a compact between sovereign powers a *government*? The government of a State is that organization in which the political power resides. It is the political being created by the *Constitution* or fundamental law. The broad and clear difference between a government and a league or compact is, that a government is a body politic; it has a will of its own; and it possesses powers and

faculties to execute its own purposes. Every compact looks to some power to enforce its stipulations. Even in a compact between sovereign communities, there always exists this ultimate reference to a power to insure its execution ; although, in such case, this power is but the force of one party against the force of another ; that is to say, the power of war. But a *government* executes its decisions by its own supreme authority. Its use of force in compelling obedience to its own enactments is not war. It contemplates no opposing party having a right of resistance. It rests on its own power to enforce its own will ; and when it ceases to possess this power, it is no longer a government.

THE STRANGE DISRUPTION.

Suddenly, the startling news breaks upon us, that seven of the thirty-four United States secede from the Union, and set up a provisional Government. This is done without in any shape setting forth any bill of grievances.

First. They do not plead that rulers have been unconstitutionally forced upon them. Not one of these States but admits that all the forms of the Constitution were observed, and that Abraham Lincoln was legally the elected President of the United States.

Secondly. They do not plead oppression, and that they are contending for the liberty of which they have been deprived. So far from this, they have freely nominated and elected all their own state officers ; they have nominated and voted for the candidates for President and Vice-President of their choice, at the same time prohibiting the casting of any votes for the republican candidates ; they have passed their own local laws, and fully carried them out ; they have participated in all the trade and commerce they desired, equally protected by the laws ; they have had perfect freedom of speech in all parts of the Union, which they forbid to others not of their way of thinking. In no one thing could they show any proof of oppression.

Thirdly. They do not plead that they were governed by rigorous laws.

In their respective States they made the laws to suit themselves, by which slave property was not only protected, but was largely exempted from taxation, whilst other property was fully taxed. [In Virginia all slaves under twelve years are exempt from taxation ; all over twelve years are valued only at 300 dollars each, though worth on an average 1,200 dollars, and on this low valuation they are taxed.]

In Congress they not only had an agency in the framing of the laws to govern the nation, but may truly be said to have made

them, for the members of the Slave States generally acted in concert, and invariably had the co-operation of a portion of the democratic members North. These united made the majority and passed the laws. It was in this way that the odious Fugitive Slave Law was carried through Congress.

Fourthly. They do not plead that they were denied a fair share of the offices of the general Government. On this point I will quote from an editorial of the *New Orleans Picayune*, as reprinted in the *Washington National Intelligencer* for November 13th, 1860. He says, "From 1789 to the election of Martin Van Buren in 1841, a period of sixty years, a Southern man occupied the chief executive, with the exception of the single term of each of the two Adams'." "During the period of nearly two generations, two-thirds of the foreign missions, and the more important of the domestic offices, were enjoyed by Southern men." "From 1841 to 1860, but two Presidents have been elected, Harrison and Fillmore, who were not emphatically the choice and really nominated and elected by the South. Of the six Presidents since 1841, three were Southern men." "It was the boast of Southern statesmen that the South had dictated the domestic policy of the nation." This testimony from this unimpeachable authority, confirmed as it is by the actual facts of the appointments made to the respective offices under the Government, prove that the South, so far from being excluded, have enjoyed an unusually large share of public offices.

Fifthly. They do not plead that their wishes have been disregarded, and that their plans have been denied them.

I must call this New Orleans editor again into the stand. He says, "The purchase of Louisiana was at the instigation of the South." This purchase was made from France in 1803, at the cost of 15,000,000 dollars, or £3,000,000, and occurred under the administration of President Jefferson, a slaveholder, and, as the editor says, "was at the instigation of the South."

He further says, "The annexation of Texas was conceived by Southern minds and achieved, by Southern votes." It will be remembered that Texas was a province of Mexico, and that Mexico, having obtained her independence from Spain, proclaimed in 1829 the immediate and entire abolition of slavery. This free territory so near became obnoxious to the Slave States. Plans were immediately entered upon to secure it to the United States. One was for the general Government to purchase it. Accordingly, in 1827, Mr. Poinsett, the American minister there, was instructed to offer for it one million of dollars. In 1829 the bid was raised to five millions of dollars, which was rejected, the Mexicans refusing

to dismember their Republic by selling Texas. Next came a series of invasions, in violation of all law and comity, until President Tyler, now in the ranks of the secessionists, negotiated with Texas a treaty of annexation, and by a united Southern vote, aided by enough of the democratic party north, the vote was carried, and in 1845 it became an integral part of the nation. This, as the editor says, "was conceived by Southern minds, and achieved by Southern votes."

The same editor thus continues,—“The war with Mexico, which added an empire in extent to the territory, is due to the policy of the South, thus extending our Southern boundaries from the limits of Texas to the Pacific Ocean.” In April, 1842, Mr. Wise, of Virginia, in a speech on the floor of Congress, openly avowed the policy of conquest, and predicted its accomplishment for the purpose of extending slavery. He gloried that “they would join the Texans, and proclaim a crusade against the rich States of the South, capture towns, rifle churches, and plant the lone star of the Texan banner on the Mexican capital.” “Let the work once begin, and I do not know that this house would hold me very long. Give me five millions of dollars, and I would undertake to do it myself. I would place California where all the powers of Great Britain would never be able to reach it. Slavery should pour itself abroad, and find no limit but the Southern Ocean. War,” he adds, “is a curse, but it has its blessings too. I would vote for this mission (of Waddy Thompson to Mexico) as a means of preserving peace; but if it must lead to war, I would vote for it more willingly.”

This speech sufficiently shows the animus—for Mr. Wise was then the recognised leader in the House of Representatives—of the policy of President Tyler. In the summer of 1845 the Mexican territory was invaded by the American army, by order of President Polk. The country was thus plunged into war unconstitutionally, it being done without the vote of Congress, with whom alone the power to declare war is vested. This was done by a slave-holding President, and for the purpose of extending the area of slavery. This war involved the United States in an expenditure of over one hundred and thirty millions of dollars, a burden thrown mainly on the industrial population of the North.

To show how early and constant has been the controlling power of the South, this same New Orleans editor still further says,—“The war of 1812 was voted for and sustained by the South.” This was the war against Great Britain, when Mr. Madison was President. He recommended it in a message to Congress. Mr. J. C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, the leader of the Southern party, was

regarded as the real instigator of this war message. The representatives from the South, with a portion of the democrats of the North, under the leadership of Mr. Calhoun, carried this measure through Congress. A motion was made in the Senate, early in June, 1812, to postpone the declaration of war until the next session of Congress in December following, when the policy of the British Government would be developed in regard to the British orders in council, the alleged chief cause of the war. A large number of the Northern members surrounded Mr. Calhoun in the lobby, imploring him to allow the country respite till December. Mr. Calhoun was inexorable, and, by extraordinary appliances, having gained over to his party one or two members, the motion in the Senate for the postponement was defeated by a majority of one. This decided the question of war, which was declared by a vote, 79 to 49 in the House of Representatives, and of 19 to 13 in the Senate. In a few weeks the news arrived, as was expected, of the repeal of the British orders in council. Had the delay, asked for by the North, been granted, there would have been no war with Great Britain in 1812. But the slave power will brook no delay, and the object of that party was gained. Well has the *New Orleans* editor said, "The war of 1812 was voted for and sustained by the South."

Sixthly. They do not plead either that there were no constitutional means of relief, or that they had been tried in vain. They have not so attempted to impose either upon themselves or upon others. Whilst the North were prompt and earnest to relieve, if practicable, their grievances, whilst a peace convention, called for the purpose of meeting the difficulties, were in session, whilst proposed amendments to the Constitution were offered, guaranteeing the protection of slave property, they dashed aside all constitutional remedies, and appealed to the sword.

Seventhly. They made no application to Congress for a peaceable division of the Union. As it required the vote of the people of the States, approving of the Constitution, with the expressed desire to be received and to constitute an integral part of the nation, and as it also required an affirmative vote of Congress to admit them as parts of the nation, it would seem that the very least they could have done would have been, first, to obtain the free, unmolested, and unbiassed sense of the legal voters in each State on the question of a peaceable division of the Union; then, if the vote was in favour of division, to bring the same properly before Congress, that they might submit the same to the action of the people, who, "to form a more perfect Union, had ordained and established the Constitution for the United States." But neither

of these steps have been taken. In not a single one of the seven seceding States, unless Texas may be an exception, has the question of secession been first submitted to the people. But, in the language of the correspondent of the *Times* for May 22nd, "An able, unscrupulous minority have seized upon the reins of power in the South, whilst the men of property, of influence, of social position, and of integrity, were paralysed by the audacity of the conspiracy." He adds :—"The originators, who were defeated at an election, have made that defeat the pretence to elevate every one of the conspirators, without a single exception, to a place of power, trust, and remuneration in the new Government."

I call attention to a few more important extracts from the leader of this New Orleans editor, as they may satisfy us that it is the South who are the continued disturbers of the peace. He continues :—"But it will be said the perpetual agitation of this question, in and out of Congress, has driven the South to unjust concessions, and increased the intolerance and agitation of the North." To this he replies as follows :—"The Missouri compromise was the first in order. If it was wrong, the South has only to blame itself, for it came from a representative of a Slave State, and was supported by the almost unanimous vote of Southern delegates in both Houses. It was ratified again and again by the popular vote of the Slave States, until it came to have almost as binding a character as the Constitution itself."

This compromise was passed in 1820, when Missouri was admitted as a Slave State, by which it was settled that all the territory south of north latitude 36.30 might be formed into States with slavery, and that all the territory north of that line was to be forever free.

The editor continues :—"The next struggle, on the question of slavery, resulted in the compromise of 1850. Here again the South gave birth to the act, and it was sustained not only by the Southern vote in Congress, but was ratified by the people." He goes on to say, "A golden era of peace and general accord followed, until the elements of sectional strife were again let loose from their sealed cavern by the repeal of the Missouri compromise and the Kansas and Nebraska Bill. Whether the South originated this act or not, it united in solid phalanx to sustain it, whilst the North was almost alone in opposition to this measure. This re-opened the agitations and plunged the country into excitement, which has resulted in the birth of a party that now stands avowedly sectional, openly aggressive, and by its doctrines insults and defies the South." Thus, on the testimony of an intelligent and competent witness, it appears that the agitations of the slavery

question, in and out of Congress, has been compelled by the South themselves, by their determination not to let the subject alone, and by their increasing demands. The editor thus sums up this part of his very important leader:—"But can we look back on the history of the past, and find serious reason to complain, except it be of our own blindness and folly?" Thus spake this editor in November last. Then he could speak freely his honest convictions; now, his columns are filled with the defence of secession and the bitter denunciation of the United States. No man changes without a motive, which appeals either to his love or his fear.

Instead of a bill of grievances setting forth in detail the various wrongs of which they complain, and for which they have by all constitutional methods in vain sought redress, they only make prominent their fear that the principles of the republican party, on which they have elected President Lincoln, are such that in their legitimate workings they must inevitably abolish slavery. As soon as the issue between the parties became clear and definite, the South renewed their threats of the dissolution of the Union, and that Mr. Lincoln, if elected, should never be inaugurated as the President of the United States.

THE POLITICAL ISSUES.

In the last Presidential election there were four parties in the field, each using all the appliances within their power to elect the favourite candidate. The first was the Republicans, who put in nomination Mr. Lincoln. Among the principles avowed on their platform or argued at the mass meetings and through the press, were—1. The solemn reiteration of the passage in the Declaration of Independence which affirms that "all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are those of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." 2. No extension of slavery beyond its present limits, that no more Slave States shall be admitted to the Union, and that efficient measures must be adopted for the immediate and entire suppression of the slave trade. 3. The essential modification of the Fugitive Slave Law. 4. The reversal of the Dred Scott decision, in which Chief Justice Taney declared that "black men had no rights which white men were bound to respect." 5. The granting of homes, from the public lands, for the homeless.

The second was the States Rights or Southern party, who nomi-

nated Mr. Breckenridge. They claimed that slavery is national, being recognised as property by the Constitution, and that wherever the flag of the Union waves, it waves for the protection of slavery; that no State can constitutionally forbid the transit of slaves through it; and that the Fugitive Slave Law must be intensified rather than modified.

The third, known as Squatter Sovereignty, nominated Mr. Douglass. They demanded the acquisition of Cuba, and affirmed that the first settlers of the territories had the right to adopt or prohibit slavery by a popular vote before they became a State, and that they must be admitted to the Union with or without slavery, according as their Constitution might determine.

The fourth, the so-called Union party, nominated Mr. Bell. They declared that all political platforms are a delusion, but they were for maintaining the Union by great concessions to the South, claiming to hold a middle ground between the republicans and the extreme Southern party.

From this statement it is evident that the great issue was slavery or freedom. The election of Mr. Lincoln would be an anti-slavery triumph. So it was considered by all parties. The result was, that Abraham Lincoln was constitutionally elected without a solitary electoral vote from the South, and with the opposition of the entire democratic and Union parties North. This settled the question that the power was with the republicans, and that the South could no longer "dictate the domestic policy of the nation."

Says the *Edinburgh Review*, for April, 1861:—"It cannot be denied that the election of Mr. Lincoln turned upon the view of the slavery question entertained by the republican party of the North."

THE PLAN OF THE REBELLION.

The republicans in the campaign of 1856 came so near electing Colonel Fremont, their candidate, that the leading politicians of the South saw that their control of the government was passing away. Accordingly, they matured their plans. Having the control of the administration of James Buchanan, who had been elected by their agency, they had four years in which to plot and make all the arrangements for the success of their treason. They made use of members of the cabinet men who had on taking office solemnly sworn to maintain the Constitution and the Union, so to arrange affairs in their respective departments, that when the blow should be struck, the Government should be powerless, and fall

before the most gigantic and well-planned treason that the world has ever known. Some of its details may thus be chronicled :—

1. The Secretary at War was to distribute the army of the United States to the most distant portions of the country ; to withdraw arms and ammunition as largely as practicable from the North ; to throw very large supplies of both into the forts and arsenals of the South, leaving them with very few soldiers, and easily to be taken by the State troops, who would be called out.

2. The Secretary of the Navy was to station a large portion of the ships of war, in commission, in distant seas ; to place others in Southern ports ; to fill the Southern navy yards with all munitions of war, leaving these positions comparatively defenceless, and to fall easily into the hands of the State forces when called out.

3. The Secretary of the Treasury was to disperse the surplus millions in the treasury, was so to fix and arrange the estimates, that the treasury should not only be exhausted, but the country actually burdened with a debt ; thus securing that when the rebellion should break out, the Government would be without the means of paying the army, the navy, or the recurring daily expenses ; and that thus it would be rendered powerless for resistance, and would fall an easy prey.

4. To bring about secession, not by submitting the question to the free popular vote of the people in the respective States, but by declaring it ; by seizing upon the forts and arming themselves with military power, and putting in peril the life and property of every man opposed to their dictation.

5. To bring about a collision with the United States. It was their plan—as I know from a statement of a New Orleans gentleman, a personal friend of mine, made to me in Rome in the month of December last—to have the United States forced to fire on them, and shed Southern blood, and then make this the war-cry to unite all the South. But the long-suffering patience of the Government thwarted them in this, and they took the initiative, and fired the first and to them the fatal gun at Fort Sumpter.

THE EXECUTION OF THE PLAN.

Simultaneously and suddenly, they assume the right of secession wholly unknown to the Constitution. They seize upon the forts, the arsenals, the arms, the ammunition, the custom-houses, the ships, the mints, with millions of treasure, all belonging to the United States, and paid for out of the national treasury. They raise armies in violation of the Constitution ; they insult the

national flag by trailing it in the streets of New Orleans after a drunken rabble ; they fire into the "Star of the West" bearing that flag ; they set at defiance all the powers of the general Government, threatening, in the language of Jefferson Davis, to make its citizens "feel Southern steel," and in the language of his Secretary at War, "to plant the flag of the Confederate States on the dome of the Capitol (Washington), and on Faneuil Hall at Boston." Their distinctly marked-out purpose was to possess Washington, to capture or put to flight the President and his cabinet, to seize the national archives, the title-deeds, and the whole national machinery, and to proclaim that the confederates have empire over the land, and that slavery is the universal law, "the corner-stone, resting on the great truth that the negro is not equal to the white man, and that slavery is his natural and moral condition." The design was, by the suddenness and violence of the first blow, to strike terror into every mind, and to paralyse all opposition, and all this was done without a blow struck by the United States—without a law passed offensive to the South ; whilst the Government were forbearing, still hoping that this rebellion would cease without an appeal to military force. But the commencement of hostilities by the confederates at Fort Sumpter and other warlike acts brought the forbearance of the Government to an end, and compelled them, if they would not abandon the loyal subjects of the Union at the South to a military despotism, if they would not prove recreant to their solemn oaths to maintain the Union, if they would not surrender the nation to dismemberment and utter ruin, to call upon the country for armed men to sustain the Government and preserve the Union. The President called, and all the Free States nobly responded with men in vast numbers, well armed, and with money equal to all the wants of the Government. The North now stands as a unit, having been compelled to that unity by the great exigency. The issue is, the integrity of the Union, or a nation dismembered by rebellion—the domination of slavery, or the maintenance and the spread of liberty.

THE QUESTION OF POWER.

Some throw off the whole subject with a shrug of their shoulders. "It is merely a lust for power," they say, "and England does not care which party succeeds, inasmuch as there is no moral principle involved." Admit that it is a contest for power, does it then follow that there is no underlying moral principle, and that

England should not care which party prevails? It is an admitted fact that the slave interest has ruled the policy of the United States for about three-fourths of a century; and how has its power been used? Hear once more the testimony of the New Orleans editor. He says:—"If slavery has been extinguished in that little patch of States denominated New England, in New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, the purchase of Louisiana has given us Louisiana, Arkansas, and Missouri, as Slave States, a region of country much larger than that from which slave sovereignty has eradicated human bondage. The annexation of Texas, in 1845, devoted to slavery a territory equal to all New England, New York, and New Jersey; and the acquisition of New Mexico, by conquest, in which slavery has been established by territorial law, carries the institution two degrees above the line of the Missouri compromise." Thus have the slave interests steadily used the national power for the extension of slavery, until the territory has been fully doubled, and the slaves have increased from 697,897 to 3,952,801. In carrying out their undeviating purpose, they have used the treasury of the United States for the purchase of new territory, also the army, the navy, and the treasury of the Union for the wars of conquest to extend the area of slavery.

There has always been a party in the United States opposed to these slavery aggressions. In 1820 it was so powerful, that it well nigh prevented the introduction of Missouri into the Union as a Slave State. The party strife was then quieted by the Missouri compromise, by which all the territory lying south of north latitude 36.30 might be formed into States with slavery, and all north of that line was to be for ever free. The North faithfully acted up to this compact, and felt bound to admit all the Slave States formed south of that line. But as soon as all the territory south was formed into States, the South suddenly discovered that this compromise, of which they had availed themselves to the uttermost, was unconstitutional, and their old ally the democratic party north acting with them, they carried the repeal, which opened the territory north to slavery. As the aggressions of the slave power became more rampant, the opposition became more intense, until the great republican party arose, which, the New Orleans editor says, "stands avowedly sectional, openly aggressive, and by its doctrines insults and defies the South."

The appeal was made to the people, the whole people, to send in their verdict through the ballot-box, whether the slave power should any longer rule the country for the extension of slavery. The response was most emphatically in the negative, and the republicans triumphantly elected their candidate. And by that

act the people took the power of the nation out of the hands of the slavery propagandists, and placed it in the hands of men to use it only for the maintenance and extension of liberty. It is impossible to gather up the actual facts, which cover long pages of history, without the firm conviction that the main issue involves the grandest moral principle of the age—the principle which England has for a century most nobly and consistently advocated, and for the carrying out of which she has expended millions of treasure.

On the one hand is a confederacy for the maintenance and extension of slavery; and because the power of the Union can no longer be used for that end, they array themselves with hostile armies to destroy that Union. As early as 1812, Mr. J. C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, thus stated the secret of their power, and when the South would destroy the Union:—"That we are essentially aristocratic I cannot deny, but we do and can yield much to democracy. This is our sectional policy. It is through our affiliation with that party, in the middle and western States, that we hold power. But when we cease thus to control this nation through a disjointed democracy, or any material obstacle in that party which shall tend to throw us out of that rule and control, we shall then resort to the dissolution of the Union." How long, and steady, and determined has been their purpose

To rule or ruin!

That slavery is the all-pervading and animating cause cannot be doubted. The *Nashville Patriot*, in an article condemning the course of Mr. Douglass, says,—“But he cannot obliterate the fact, that the slavery question underlies the whole controversy, and is the true cause of the contest of arms which is to come.”

The Constitution of the confederates makes slavery national and perpetual. In the language of Mr. Stephens, the Vice-president of the confederacy, “The new Constitution has put to rest for ever all the agitating questions relating to our peculiar institution, African slavery, as it exists among us. Its foundations are laid, its corner-stone rests, upon the great truth, that the negro is not equal to the white man; that slavery, subordination to a superior race, is his natural and moral condition.” It cuts off all the States from the slave markets of the South, unless they join this confederacy. Hence, should Virginia remain loyal to the Union, she could not send a negro slave for sale to Charleston, Mobile, or New Orleans. But the so-called “first families” of Virginia live on slave breeding. The annual sale of slaves from that State amounts to eight millions of dollars. This will account for the intense zeal

of a faction in Virginia to carry that State out of the Union in opposition to the strong popular vote to the contrary, and notwithstanding that such a move must certainly divide or revolutionize that State. The personal interests of the slave-breeders of Virginia, Maryland, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Missouri, caused their determination to carry those States into the Southern Confederacy. With a Southern Confederacy formed, and which they hope will be a permanent Government, whose Constitution excludes all from its slave markets who are not joined with them, what are these slave-breeders to do unless they can carry their States into this confederacy? The North will not buy their slaves; the other Border States do not want them; the Southern market is their only hope, but from that market they are excluded unless they join this confederacy; there is no alternative; they must either give up their breeding, or carry their States into the confederacy, and this accounts for all their desperation. The editor of the *Nashville Patriot* speaks from knowledge, then, when he says,—“The slavery question underlies the whole controversy, and is the true cause of the contest of arms which is to come.” Mr. Russell, the special correspondent of the *Times*, says, under date of April 30th (*Times*, May 28th),—“Their whole system rests on slavery, and, as such, they defend it.”

On the other hand, is the glorious old Union, which has stood firm amid many storms, its power now wrested from the hands of the slavery propagandists, and hereafter to be wielded, not to extend slavery, but to put a cordon around it. Thus limited, it must as certainly die as do scorpions girt about with fire. To live it must have new soil; for it curses and exhausts the very earth on which it treads.

Now, England must stultify herself and ignore all her past brilliant career in the abolition of slavery, if for a moment the warm pulsations of her heart should beat in sympathy with those who rebel and endeavour to destroy the American Union because they can no longer use it for the protection and extension of slavery. That heart of England, when reached, must send its generous acclaim to the noble band who for years have struggled, and who now hold the power of the Union to use it for the cause of liberty. That same heart will rejoice with unfeigned gladness that all party differences are buried, and that the whole North are united in this great battle of liberty against slavery. Says the New York correspondent of the *Times*,—“The great Southern rebellion is believed to be the result of a conspiracy to overthrow the free institutions of the United States when they should cease to be perverted for the use of filibustering and the extension

of negro slavery : it is a conspiracy long plotted, well conceived, and nearly successful, directed by the men who originated the Ostend manifesto, who have encouraged the attempts on Cuba, who assisted Walker by pecuniary aid when they had it, and who advocate in Savannah, Charleston, and Mobile the re-opening of the African slave trade." The grand issue which the providence of God is forcing upon the United States is this,—Which shall rule, Slavery or Liberty? The people are making haste to array themselves under the one or other of these banners. Multitudes at the North who were the apologists for slavery, and were willing, for the sake of peace and profit, to grant all that the South demanded, now say, "Let the curse be wiped out now while our hand is in." Said the Honourable Daniel S. Dickinson, in a speech recently delivered in New York city,— "Now the South, first by seceding, and, secondly, by firing on the old flag, have closed the door of reconciliation. He was for meeting them on their own ground. He would have no half-way measures, no compromises. Let us settle this thing speedily and surely. It may ruin this generation, but we owe it to the next that they shall have no such troubles as we have had. He would strike now, in our might, and, if necessary, wipe the South from the face of the earth. He knew that they would have civil war, and, what was far worse, servile war ; and he would make the prophecy that, by the time this matter was settled, the peculiar institution of the South would be swept away. Let us finish things while we are about it, and leave nothing behind us." These are not the words of Wendell Phillips, nor of William Lloyd Garrison, the leaders of the Abolitionists,—these are not the utterances of a republican orator, but the deep convictions of the leader of the great democratic party in the State of New York and of the whole North. He but expresses the feelings of the great masses. Says the *Philadelphia North American*,—"It is not to be denied that Mr. Dickinson spoke the sentiments of vast numbers of people in the North, who are wearied out with this unending excitement, and are resolved now to make a finish of it in some way." The democratic party now see how their confidence in the South has been betrayed, how they have been deceived and cheated by those Southern leaders with whom they had acted, and by whom they have been led to the very verge of treason ; and now they are the most intensely indignant at this foul rebellion. I am neither curious nor critical about the motives which may have influenced the masses at the North so thoroughly to change their convictions to that of united opposition to the Southern secession. I am well pleased that the providence of God has

made a united North; that that North now sees most clearly, that slavery is *the great disturbing element* in our body politic; that there can be no permanent peace whilst it is allowed any controlling power, and that it must now be placed where it can never again disturb the peace or endanger the permanency of the Union. I do not for a moment doubt that the same Divine Providence which is so actively and resolutely fighting against slavery will so advance that united North, that the grand and glorious result shall be the speedy and the entire abolition of slavery.

ENCOURAGEMENTS FOR LIBERTY.

The careful student of events cannot have failed to notice that the irrepressible tendencies of the age are towards liberty. This is true, without an exception, in all parts of the world. In a rapid stream there often occur obstructions which cause, in localities, an eddy current which sets the waters backwards. The inexperienced might suppose that the current had turned, but a little patience will undeceive him, and show that the great body of the water was moving steadily onward. So it is with the opinions of the world on the subject of slavery. Nation after nation have abolished it from their soil, until the United States stands almost alone, boasting of the greatest freedom, and at the same time holding the largest number of slaves. The time was when the Anti-slavery sentiment was so prevalent in Virginia, that it well-nigh made it a free State. But that day passed away, and the Pro-slavery sentiment became most rampant there. There was a cause, a most potent cause, for this change. When Virginia felt moved towards emancipation, the price of an able-bodied slave was only 300 dollars, or about £60. To breed slaves at that price would not pay. They were becoming a burden to their masters, and selfishness asked how can we get rid of them. But just at this juncture, the rich bottom lands of Alabama and Louisiana, suitable for the growing of cotton and the sugar-cane, were thrown into the market. This caused a large demand for slaves, and this demand raised their market price from 300 dollars, or £60, to 1,500 dollars, or £300. This made slave breeding profitable in Virginia, Maryland, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Missouri, and intensified the Pro-slavery sentiment by the simplest and most natural of all laws,—that of profit.

The great increase of cotton, as well as the advance in its price, by the increased use of the article by the manufacturers of Eng-

land, stimulated the Pro-slavery sentiments of the planters. Whilst they were making very large profits, it were vain to argue with them about either the morality of slavery or the unprofitableness of slave labour. Again, this increase in the price and consumption of cotton made more business, which appealed to the pecuniary interests of the North. This made the North more complacent, more willing to concede to the South, and the South became more and more aggressive in their demands until it seemed as though the whole force of the stream set in favour of slavery. In fact, the price of a pound of cotton in Liverpool or Manchester determined the value of a slave in Alabama. Thus England, with all her strong Anti-slavery feeling, became the great supporter of slavery, by being the largest purchaser of the cotton raised by slave labour. This the *Times* clearly demonstrated in its columns of October 7th, 1858 :—"An advance of one penny per pound in the price of American cotton is welcomed by the slave-owner of the Southern States as supplying him with the sinews of war for the struggle now waging with the Northern abolitionists. This mere advance of one penny per pound on our present annual consumption is equivalent to an annual subscription of 16,000,000 dollars, or £3,200,000, toward the maintenance and extension of American slavery." Of the entire cotton crop from the United States, England takes a little more than one-half, the Northern States of America take about one-fourth ; the remaining fraction, being less than one-fourth, finds its way mainly to France, Switzerland, and Germany. Could England procure enough of cotton from other sources, so as to require only about one-third or one-fourth of the entire crop of the United States, cotton would fall to such a price as to render its cultivation by slave labour unprofitable, and this would be an argument which every slaveholder would be compelled to heed.

It is no wonder, when the price of cotton was so remunerative, its consumption so extended, and the supply from all other sources so inadequate, that the South should feel that they had the monopoly of this article, and cried out exultantly, "Cotton is King." When the response came from the North and from the greatest nation of the old world, "Cotton is King," it is no wonder that they became maddened, and cried the louder, "Cotton is King, Cotton is King, and he shall reign supreme." To the superficial observer all this looked as though the stream had turned back, but all this while the deep waters were moving on, undermining that great rock of slavery which thus obstructed the current, and preparing that rock for its final plunge which shall bury it in the depths of oblivion.

Even in the United States, notwithstanding the slavery demonstrations and progress, the irrepressible tendencies of the age have been towards liberty. So much so, that every aggressive movement of the slave power has resulted in the advancement of liberty. Let me call attention to a few out of many illustrations.

1. **THE RIGHT OF PETITION.**—When petitions were presented to Congress for the abolition of slavery in the district of Columbia and the inter-slave trade, the South sprang forth, and imperiously demanded the exclusion of all petitions on that subject. In obedience to their demand, a series of gag laws were passed, which controlled the action of Congress for several years. They gloried that they had crushed the right of petition, and that slavery should never be a debateable question on the floor of Congress. But through the indomitable courage of John Quincy Adams, “the old man eloquent”—whom the Southerners threatened with expulsion from the house, with indictment by the grand jury, and with assassination—the gags were all blotted out from the records, the right of petition on any and all subjects fully vindicated. Since then slavery has been frequently discussed in both Houses of Congress in the freest and fullest manner. Thus their hasty triumph was their sure and permanent defeat.

2. **THE ANNEXATION OF TEXAS.**—When that State, of enormous dimensions, was, in 1845, admitted to the Union, it was with the permission of making five States out of it whenever the necessary population should be there. The obvious design of this peculiar provision was always to have a new Slave State ready for admission whenever a new free State applied. In one section, very suitable for a new State, there was sufficient population. Why, then, was it not set off and admitted? For the very best of all reasons. That section was settled mainly by German and Swiss emigrants, who were most successfully cultivating cotton by free labour. The vote, if submitted to this section, would be for a Constitution without slavery. Thus the slave power dared not carry out their original intention, and attempt to make a new State out of the territory included within the boundaries of that State. The providence of God had directed thither a race of settlers hostile to slavery.

3. **THE MEXICAN WAR.**—This war was waged in order “to place California where all the powers of Great Britain would never be able to reach it, and that slavery might pour itself abroad, and find no limit but the Southern Ocean.” The war went on; the American armies were victorious; strongholds—the capital itself, with California—were all conquered; and it seemed as though slavery was about to triumph and increase its area. But just at

this moment of triumph, President Polk, himself a slaveholder, is reminded that a new Presidential election is near, and that it would never do to go to the people with a war on hand which Congress had not declared. Accordingly, he solicits and obtains from Congress millions of money to buy a peace. All the forts and the territory taken from Mexico, including California, are restored, and by a special treaty California is purchased. Now, just at this point of time, the discovery of gold hurries many thousands there from all parts of the world. A new State is formed, but with a Constitution having this provision—"Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except for the punishment of crime, shall ever be tolerated in this State."

When through its commissioners it made application for admission to the Union, the opposition was violent and protracted. Mr. Calhoun, of South Carolina, demanded not only the rejection of California, but other concessions to the slave power; but all in vain. California was admitted, with her Constitution prohibiting slavery.

Up to this time the free and the Slave States were equal in number, and consequently had an equal number of votes in the Senate, each State being entitled to two senators. But by the admission of California as a free State, it gave the free States the majority. So, then, the war which was waged to acquire new territory, out of which new Slave States were to be formed, actually added a new free State to the Union; and thus was destroyed the balance in the vote of the Senate, and the majority permanently settled on the side of freedom.

4. THE ADOPTION OF THE FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW.—This was designed to compel the North, under severe penalties, to catch and return all fugitive slaves. The provisions of this law violated so many principles of justice and humanity, that it shocked the moral sense of multitudes who had sympathized with the South. Its provisions were so humiliating to the North, that it woke up the most intense and determined opposition, and greatly helped in forming a strong Anti-slavery sentiment. The law was so summary in its process, and so severe in its measures, that it signally failed in the object it aimed to accomplish, and caused such a reaction, that the wisest of the Southern politicians admitted that its passage was a fatal mistake.

5. THE REPEAL OF THE MISSOURI COMPROMISE.—This, together with the Kansas and Nebraska Bill, inaugurated the so-called doctrine of Squatter Sovereignty. The design was to open all the territories of the North for the introduction of slavery, from which, by the compromise, it had been for ever excluded. This

repeal, though carried by the help of the democratic members of Congress, still permanently divided that party. So treacherous were the South as to all compacts, and so unscrupulous in their measures, that great multitudes who had, up to this time, acted with them, now sundered the connexion. The repeal of this compromise released the North from every bond or obligation to admit any more Slave States whether below or above the line of north latitudes 36.30; and this prepared the way for making prominent the fundamental principle in the republican platform, that "NO MORE SLAVE STATES SHALL BE ADMITTED TO THE UNION." Had not the South repealed that compromise, vast multitudes at the North would have felt themselves to be honourably bound by the compact which their fathers had made, and thus the good cause would have been most seriously embarrassed. Kansas now became the battle-ground. The most violent and bloody measures were resorted to by the Pro-slavery party to secure the adoption of a Constitution recognising slavery. This struggle continued for several years with all the co-operation which the administrations of Presidents Pierce and Buchanan could command; but liberty stood firm against violence and seductions, and gloriously triumphed, and that State is now admitted to the Union with a Constitution for ever excluding slavery. This struggle, though long continued, was most influential on the public mind; it made many desert the Pro-slavery side, and made many true and steadfast friends to the republicans. It was by these unscrupulous measures, which dashed aside the most solemn compacts, made in all honesty, and by the North carried out in good faith,—it was by those violent acts which brought bands of armed border ruffians into Kansas from the State of Missouri, to seize the polls, and, after unlawfully voting themselves, preventing all others from voting, unless for the ticket they presented,—it was by the ever-increasing demands of the South that slavery should be recognised as national, and be everywhere protected by the national power, and that unless their largest demands for slavery were granted, they would destroy the Union, that gave birth to a party which the Southern editor says "stands avowedly sectional, openly aggressive, and by its doctrines insults and defies the South." That party, forced into political existence by the action of the South, and increased in its power by the increasing violence of the South, have elected President Lincoln without a solitary electoral vote from the South. It appears to be the unmistakeable design of Providence to make slavery dig its own grave.

THE ACT OF SECESSION.

This last act in the great drama seems more certainly to foretel the doom of slavery than anything that has yet occurred. The basis on which this confederacy is avowedly reared is slavery, and that slavery rests on their present cotton monopoly. They exultantly state that all the world must pay tribute to them, and submit to the terms of their dictation. Were it not for this conviction of their strength, they never would have ventured on the bold measures they have adopted. Holding this monopoly, they argue that the nations must purchase of them, that this will bring commerce, and with it increase of business; thus they see wealth rolling in upon them as long as cotton grows. It cannot be denied that this is the strongest and most threatening monopoly which any age has witnessed. It holds in its grasp the article which enters into the home comfort of every family in the civilized world. Its transportation gives life to commerce and burdens railroad trains; its manufacture employs many millions of capital and furnishes employment to many millions of the labouring classes. It may properly be regarded as one of the necessities of life. The Board of Trade reports that the world consumes all the cotton that can at present be produced, and that the supply from all other sources has not made any impression upon the demand from the United States. Its price has ruled high, so high that those who hold the monopoly have realized large profits. Believing that all other cotton fields are insufficient in their yield, that the staple of all other countries is inferior, and that the vast manufacturers in Europe must have their cotton, they are confident that they must triumph, and that sooner or later, if necessary, the countries of Europe who need their cotton must help them. Thus they confidently rely upon their monopoly of cotton, not taking into the calculation the fact that God is against monopolies. God has wrought into the very structure of human society a law which in its operation undermines and destroys monopolies, especially those which oppress the poor. To illustrate my meaning, I must briefly refer to a few examples. It is understood that certain distinguished bankers, with their immense wealth and widely-extended agencies, undertook to control the market by holding the entire supply of quicksilver. The plan was simple, and the remuneration immense. They knew all the facts about quicksilver then patent—the annual consumption, the amount in the market, the sources of supply, and their ability to purchase and hold the entire stock.

But one thing they did not and could not know, viz., what plans of development God then had in progress. It happened just then that new and rich discoveries were made of quicksilver in California, which defeated all their well-planned calculations. "Go to now, ye that say, To-day or to-morrow we will go into such a city and continue there a year, and buy and sell and get gain; whereas ye know not what shall be on the morrow, for that ye ought to say, If the Lord will, we shall live and do this."

We are told that the kingdom of Naples once undertook the monopoly of sulphur, designing to make the world tributary to them. But, unfortunately for all their calculations, the busy meddling brains of chemists, who are always prying and curious, found out an article which to such an extent took the place of sulphur, as not only to destroy this monopoly, but to reduce the sulphur manufactories to the minimum profit.

On the discovery of guano, the Peruvian Government undertook to monopolise this fertiliser, thus securing for themselves immense wealth. The high price drove the enterprising to make new discoveries of other deposits. So the restless chemists, having analyzed the article and discovered all its parts and proportions, combined an article of the same ingredients as valuable to the farmer, and they have already, in some parts of the world, glutted the market with a new and cheaper fertiliser.

The cotton monopoly must fall before this same law. As with the Malakoff, it is only a matter of time: the fall is certain, a fact to be recorded in history, and to be recorded at a much earlier date than many imagine. Just at this time a most remarkable machine has been invented for the preparation of flax for the looms. "This machine cuts and binds the bundles. When dried it is steep rotted in vats, the water being heated by steam to 95 Fahr. for two or three days, which dissolves the resinous and colouring matter; then it is spread on an endless sheet and carried through a washing process, which removes the soluble gum; then it passes between the rollers which press out the water; then through a drying apparatus; then through a breaking and cleaning machine which pulverises the woody stem and removes it all without breaking or tangling the fibre; and then through a combing and gill-drawing machine from which it is delivered in a continuous band of clean flax, running into cans, from which it is wound in balls for the spinning factory. The cost of a mill is 20,000 dols., or £4,000. It will yield one ton per day, at 25 dols., or £5 per day for running it. One ton of flax straw will yield 400 lbs. of pure flax. Flax straw at 10 dols., or £2, per ton is more profitable to the farmer than the raising Indian corn or wheat. The cost of the

pure fibre is 4 cents, or 2d. per lb. It can be spun and woven for less than 3 cents, or 1½d."

The cost of the fibre ready for spinning is 4 cents, or 2d. a pound, whilst that of cotton is from 8 cents to 12 cents, or 4d. to 6d. a pound. But as flax is heavier than cotton, it will not spread over as much surface. Still, if the cost of flax can be so far reduced as to take the place of articles manufactured of cotton to the amount of one-third or even one-fourth, it must cause a heavy fall in the market value of cotton. This must reach the point where cotton cannot be profitably raised by slave labour, and this will certainly break the cotton monopoly and secure the abolition of slavery. It is instructive to know that the minds of the benevolent and enterprising on both sides of the Atlantic are now turned towards the culture of flax and the improvement of machinery for its manufacture, so that it may largely take the place of cotton. All this I regard only as auxiliary.

The working of the law which fights against monopolies we shall find in the cotton crop itself. Let the facts of the past be the indicators of the future. Not being conversant personally with the commercial aspects of cotton, I avail myself of some of the calculations in relation to the past and its probable future, which I find in the issue of the *Independent*, a New York paper, for January 24th, 1861. I have carefully examined all the subsequent issues of the same paper, and have not found a line that calls in question the accuracy of those calculations, nor have I been able to learn that any one has pointed out any fallacy in them. I use so much of that article as will illustrate and enforce my argument. From this source I learn that in 1850 there were imported into England 669,576,000 lbs. of cotton; and that in the year 1857 the importations from all sources amounted to 975,637,167 lbs., showing an increase in seven years of 306,061,167 lbs. The vital question in this statement is, from whence was the increase? As this is answered, there is hope or despondency.

The increase from the United States was	161,604,906 lbs.
The increase from the East Indies was	131,465,402 „
The increase from Egypt was	5,910,730 „
The increase from the West Indies was	1,184,667 „
The increase from Africa and other places was	5,895,462 „
	<hr/>
	306,061,167 „

In this statement no account is made of Brazil, because in these seven years there was no increase, but a small falling-off.

If we carefully examine these figures, we shall perceive that

whilst the gross increase of these seven years yielded from the United States 161,604,906 lbs., the increase during the same time from the East Indies was 131,465,402 lbs., that is, the excess of increase from the United States above that from the East Indies was only 30,139,504 lbs. This stands out as a great and encouraging fact. Two additional and not less interesting facts are also manifested. The first is, the capability of the cotton-growing countries to keep pace with the increasing consumption. The second is, the ability of the countries where the cotton is grown by free labour to outstrip those in which the plant is cultivated by slaves.

If we take the imports into England for the year 1857, which amounted to 975,637,167 lbs., as the basis, and allow only the same ratio of increase as was actual from 1843 to 1857, a period of fourteen years, and carry on the same calculation for a second term of fourteen years, we shall have the following as the result in 1871:—

The United States will then yield.....	752,971,754 lbs.
The East Indies will then yield.....	720,973,853 „
The West Indies will then yield	866,149,800 „
Brazil will then yield.....	45,464,464 „
Egypt will then yield	31,216,849 „
Africa and other places will then yield	23,758,480 „
	<hr/>
	2,440,535,200 „

The amount from the West Indies seems so disproportionally large, that I hesitated to admit it into the estimate, but I could not throw it out, as the article from which I have transcribed these figures makes the calculation from the per centage of yield for the fourteen years from 1843 to 1857, and carrying out that same per centage for another fourteen years, ending with 1871, the above figures are the result. The whole calculation supposes that the inducement and the enterprise from 1857 to 1871 shall not exceed that which operated from 1843 to 1857. The same article states that the increased consumption of cotton from 1843 to 1857 was 45 per cent., and that to carry the same out from 1857 to 1871, England will then need 1,405,512,312 lbs. How will the account stand in 1871?

The entire importation for 1871 to England will be...	2,440,535,200 lbs.
Deduct the amount from the United States	752,971,754 „
	<hr/>
This leaves the balance of	1,685,563,446 „
Needed for England, as above	1,405,512,312 „
	<hr/>
Leaving a surplus of.....	280,051,134 „

without importing a single pound of cotton from the United States. I confess that when I first read this article in the *Independent*, and came to this result, I was not a little amazed. I have called the attention of several accomplished mercantile friends capable of testing these calculations, and they have assured me that the calculations are accurate upon the basis stated.

I have said that the estimates are made upon the supposition that the inducements to enterprise will be no greater between 1857 and 1871 than they were between 1843 and 1857. But we know that the present troubles in America are justly stimulating British enterprise to an unwonted degree. So that it is fair to conclude that the amount which England will import in 1871 will far exceed the 1,405,512,312 lbs. named above. So also it may be proper to state that the consumption may be increased more than the forty-five per cent. from 1843 to 1857. Making due allowance for both these, still there must be an amount imported from other sources so large as to demand very little, and that only of the finest qualities, from the United States. The Indies must roll in a vast increase; Australia will make large contributions; Africa will bring forward her long-hidden treasures, brought to light by the indomitable energies of that wonderful man, Dr. Livingstone; Egypt, with Brazil and South America, will so increase the grand total, that England will no longer be dependent upon the cotton planters of the Slave States of North America. The day is near when England, instead of taking more than one-half of the entire crop produced by the slaves in the United States, will take so small a moiety, that American cotton will become a drug in the market, and the high price must give way and go down. Thus the proud and arrogant monopoly of the Southern States must break down under the operation of a law which no human combinations can counteract or retard.

This consummation is to be hastened by the present action of the cotton States. The design of God is, that they themselves shall destroy that in which they trust, and of which they make their boast. No man could have been insane enough to have imagined such a movement on the part of the South. It seems to be the height of madness, beyond all parallel, for them thus to peril every interest which they held in safety under the Constitution, and by plunging the country into this causeless civil war, to ruin the very monopoly on which all their hopes for prosperity and nationality were based.

Nothing could possibly have united the North against them but this causeless attempt to destroy the Union and to crush the Government, unless they could rule and use it with all its energies

for the unlimited spread of slavery. The providence of God fought against them by the action of the civilized world against slavery. It now fights against them by energizing the enterprise of the world for new inventions, and the increased productiveness of the cotton regions; and still more intensely does that same Divine providence fight against them by the burying of all party strifes at the North, and the uniting of all hearts there to sustain the Government and preserve the Union.

As the South proclaim slavery to be the corner-stone of their political edifice, appeal to the sword to maintain and extend negro bondage, and make war upon the Union the more securely to carry out their dark purpose, so the North must become more and more anti-slavery: the great exigency demands it, the enormous pressure of the South compels it, and the interests of humanity cry aloud for it. Self-preservation, the first and highest law of nature, instinctively points to the destruction of slavery as the only sure hope of future and permanent peace. The doom of slavery is sealed, the South cannot now save it, the North cannot now save it, for the days of compromises have past. Then what remains but to hurl it into the deep pit which it has unwittingly dug for itself, and to plant upon its grave the Stars and the Stripes, the bold, daring emblems of Liberty?

“The Star-spangled Banner, O long may it wave
O’er the land of the free, UNTROD BY A SLAVE.”

“ESTO PERPETUA.”

POSTSCRIPT.

MY attention having been called to several questions, I fill up the space left by the following brief answers.

1. WHY NOT SETTLE THE DIFFICULTIES BY A COMPROMISE?—Because there is nothing left for a compromise. (See pages 15 and 22.) The North were so intent upon peace and averse to war, that they were ready to surrender almost anything. They were willing to agree even to an alteration of the Constitution, so as to secure the peculiar institution. But the South rejected all attempts at compromise; seized the forts, the arsenals, the navy yards, the ships, the custom-houses, the post-offices, and the mints, with millions of treasure, all belonging to the United States. They tore down the flag of the Union, and in its place hoisted the Confederate flag. They called out armed bands, and commenced actual war upon the United States, declaring their determination to seize the

Capital, and to destroy the Union. The Federal Government bore long with them, using all possible appliances for peace, and did not call a man to arms until the South had actually inaugurated the war at Fort Sumpter, and were marching their troops for the purpose of seizing Washington. Then, and not till then, did President Lincoln call for armed men to maintain the Government and preserve the Union. What possible confidence could be placed in the permanency of any compromise with a party who used the Missouri compromise until all the territory south of the line agreed upon was formed into Slave States, and admitted to the Union; and then, when they could gain nothing more from it, ruthlessly cast it aside under the plea that it was unconstitutional, and was of no binding force? What confidence could the North have in a party who openly avow that they are not and will not be bound even by the Constitution, the supreme law of the land, and which they, many times, under the *solemnities of an oath*, most solemnly bound themselves to maintain? Such is the position of the parties, that no compromise can now permanently settle the difficulties.

2. WHAT WILL BE THE EFFECT ON SLAVERY SHOULD A PEACEABLE SEPARATION BE EFFECTED?—The difficulties in the way of a peaceable separation are so many and formidable, as to banish the hope, I may even say, the desire, that it should be accomplished. Among the obstacles I only hint at a few. 1. How can the property question between the parties, involving many hundreds of millions of dollars, be adjusted? Should the balance against the South be agreed upon, what security could they give for the faithful performance of the compact on their part, after their violation of compromises and the Constitution, and their repudiation of private and of public debts? 2. Large amounts of the present debt of the United States are held by English capitalists; will those capitalists take the bonds of the Confederate States for one-third of the amount, and look to them alone for payment, or will they insist that the North shall pay the whole national debt? Would this be justice? 3. Such is the nature of the country, and the course which the great rivers take to the sea, that any peaceable division of the States is impracticable. The rivers which rise in the great west and north-west, and float their commerce, enter the Gulf of Mexico; so also some of the chief rivers which fall into the Chesapeake Bay, rise in and flow through New York and Pennsylvania. Now, it is obvious that the interests of these enterprising portions cannot submit to have the outlets of their rivers in the hands and under the control of another nation. 4. No treaties could be entered into, with any hope of permanency, as one party are notorious for violating compromises, destroying Constitutional Unions, and repudiation of debts, when they judged it for their interest. 5. Two nations thus situated and jealous of each other must ensure constant and bloody Border wars, until the one power conquers and subjugates the other. A separation cannot be peaceful in its results.

The influence on slavery if effected would be disastrous. This new nation bases its organization upon slavery as its corner-stone, and proposes to make it perpetual. Slavery must have new soil for its spread, but this can only be obtained by conquest of territory further South; this will perpetuate wars upon the weaker nations. The slaves in the Border

States will largely escape to the free States, which will compel the masters at once to sell them to the South if they would not loose them. This, it is true, will break up the breeding of slaves in the Border States, which will certainly demand the re-opening of the slave-trade, in order to supply the necessary force to work the land, which can no longer be obtained from the Border States. The results, then, of the called-for peaceful separation will be incessant and bloody Border wars, aggressive wars on the weaker nations further South, the perpetuation and extension of slavery, and the re-opening of the slave-trade with all its horrors.

3. WHAT WILL BE THE EFFECT ON SLAVERY IF THE INTEGRITY OF THE UNION IS MAINTAINED?—Admit that the South shall still have the same Constitutional rights, and still it follows that slavery must ultimately cease. 1. Having utterly failed in breaking up the Union, all future threats from the South of this kind will be idle. 2. The slave power having lost the control of the Government, can no longer use it for these purposes. 3. The North, having had expensive experience of the desperation and treachery of the South, will no longer yield to their demands, and thus for the future will be rendered harmless, not endangering the public peace. 4. The South will understand that it is the will of the nation that no more Slave States are to be added to the Union. This puts a cordon around slavery so that it cannot spread, and thus is taken away all that lust for new territory which has already cost the nation so large an amount of blood and treasure. 5. The present troubles in America have opened the eyes of vast multitudes there to the curse of slavery, and have produced wonderful and permanent changes in public sentiment adverse to slavery, and which must ultimately take shape in the form of law. 6. The troubles in the United States are stimulating England to seek her supplies of cotton from other sources, which must certainly break down their present monopoly there, and when their monopoly is gone, the days of slavery are numbered. The Government can only act in accordance with the powers of the Constitution, which gives them no authority to emancipate the slaves, except as the contraband of war. Their present imperative duty is to carry out the Constitution and preserve the Union by putting down this rebellion. When that is done, then, and not till then, can it be expected that the attention of the country will be turned to any questions of reform. The good people of England must have a little patience with their cousins in America, and not demand of them certain reforms whilst a civil war is in progress, which the Confederates inaugurated, and have forced upon the Union. All questions of reform have always stopped in England when they have a rebellion to put down, even when that rebellion is so remote as India. We only imitate this example when we *first and exclusively* attend to the rebellion which is in our own land. That great and important reforms will certainly come, well pleasing to English hearts, I have no doubt. You know from experience the difficulty of changing ancient usages and laws by which vast amounts of property are involved, and that it takes time, and thought, and patience to eradicate organic evils, unless God wipes them out by terrible and bloody convulsions.